Singapore Master Plan 2019 → 2025: changes and property implications

Research date: **28 September 2026**. Independent analysis of official open data; this is a planning screen, not a property valuation or a recommendation to buy a particular asset.

Attribution, copyright and third-party material

Contains information from the URA Master Plan 2019 Land Use layer, Master Plan 2025 Land Use Layer, and Master Plan 2019 Planning Area Boundary (No Sea), accessed on 28 September 2026 from data.gov.sg, and made available under the terms of the Singapore Open Data Licence version 1.0. The underlying datasets remain the intellectual property of the respective agencies. This is independent analysis; URA does not endorse it and it is not an official URA product.

© 2026 calvinyst.me - original commentary and presentation. Map street tiles © OpenStreetMap contributors, available under the Open Database Licence (ODbL). OpenStreetMap attribution is also shown on the map.

What the comparison establishes

The latest full plan is Master Plan 2025, and its immediate predecessor is Master Plan 2019. MP2025 was gazetted on 1 December 2025. The downloadable land-use layers describe December 2019 and December 2025 snapshots. The 2019 catalogue was updated on 5 December 2025 and the 2025 catalogue on 27 March 2026; those catalogue dates do not turn the data into live plans. URA gazette circular, previous plans.

The map overlays **113,212 old polygons and 113,394 new polygons**. After screening for small boundary differences and removing NA-to-blank GPR encoding changes, it identifies **4,793 overlapping fragments with attribute differences**. These are pieces of planning polygons, not 4,793 properties, development projects, or independent planning decisions. Changes can reflect amendments made during the 2019-2025 period, completed development, or updated mapping; they are not necessarily fresh announcements in 2025. MP2019 dataset, MP2025 dataset.

Mutually exclusive screen category	Overlap fragments	Summed overlap area, approx. ha
Designated land use changes, including any simultaneous GPR change	3,973	3,670.3
Numeric GPR rises, with land use unchanged	209	379.3
Numeric GPR falls, with land use unchanged	154	132.5
GPR changes involving a nonnumeric code, with land use unchanged	457	701.4
Total retained	4,793	4,883.5

Areas are sums of intersections, not a cadastral inventory. Some source overlaps remain: the displayed polygons' summed area exceeds their union by about 2.4 ha. One-metre display simplification also slightly changes rendered areas; tabulated areas use the unsimplified intersections. Use these rounded totals for screening, not for land valuation.

The most useful signals

Residential rezoning is a supply signal as well as an amenity signal. About 412.0 ha of screened overlaps move from Reserve Site to Residential; 118.0 ha move from Sports & Recreation to Residential; and 55.6 ha move from Educational Institution to Residential. These are gross transitions, not net additional housing land and not unit-count forecasts. Conversely, about 127.9 ha move from Residential to Park. Planning land for housing can support population and services, while adding competitors for resale and rental demand.

An explicit numerical uplift is more actionable for a feasibility review than a special code. The map includes the following same-use residential examples. The location is a planning area; the ID identifies the exact overlap on the map. None is established here as privately owned, available for sale, or an en-bloc candidate.

Map ID / planning area	GPR 2019 → 2025	Arithmetic change	Overlap area, ha	Practical interpretation
D05161 · Clementi	2.8 → 4.2	+50.0%	4.99	Material density difference; check existing approved GFA and the complete development site.
D10187 · Bedok	3.5 → 4.2	+20.0%	5.16	Worth investigating whether added capacity remains unused or has already been realised.
D08075 · Kallang	3.5 → 4.1	+17.1%	3.91	Potential intensification; transport, height and other controls still matter.
D04997 · Tengah	2.8 → 3.0	+7.1%	6.74	Modest density revision; do not equate it with a 7.1% property-price rise.
D08449 · Tampines	2.8 → 2.9	+3.6%	6.89	Small change; its economic significance depends on the actual development and measurement basis.
D04459 · Bukit Batok	2.8 → 2.5	-10.7%	4.40	A counterexample: reliance on the older mapped density could overstate redevelopment potential.

These examples are reproducible from the source IDs and coordinates in the change register. They have been checked against the downloaded polygon attributes; they are not individual legal planning opinions.

Reserve Site does not mean confirmed housing. The largest retained use transition is a roughly 687.6 ha overlap in Paya Lebar, from Special Use to Reserve Site (D01749). It supports monitoring long-term transformation, but the new designation in this layer does not itself specify residential use, a numeric GPR, a land-sale date or a completion date. Avoid paying a premium based on an assumed detailed scheme.

Some large residential transitions retain a special GPR code. A roughly 113.9 ha overlap in Sungei Kadut moves from Sports & Recreation to Residential (D05726), with GPR changing from EVA to SDP. This establishes a designated-use difference, but no numeric density uplift can be calculated from those codes. URA separately identifies the former Singapore Racecourse at Kranji as a future housing estate; its gazette announcement describes further detailed planning. URA gazette announcement.

A redevelopment story may already have existed in 2019. Broad transformation announcements must be checked against the old zoning before being labelled new. The former Bukit Timah Turf City area, for example, needs an examination of changed roads, parks and detailed parcels, not an assumption that every future residential area represents new residential rezoning in 2025. The map can be filtered to Bukit Timah to inspect actual overlaps.

Where to focus further research

The following are research priorities, not expected-return rankings. The quantitative observations come from the spatial overlay; the implications are analyst inference.

Research area	Observed signal	Opportunity to investigate	Main counterweight
Yishun	About 151.2 ha changes into the exact Residential category from other uses.	Compare existing homes near eventual amenities with new supply as plans become specific.	New launches may compete with existing homes; the layer does not distinguish public and private housing.
Sungei Kadut / Kranji context	About 123.8 ha changes into Residential; there are also many business-zone and GPR-code changes.	Long-term neighbourhood renewal and changing employment patterns.	Staging, industrial transition, special controls and long holding periods.
Queenstown and Bukit Merah	About 91.0 ha and 80.0 ha respectively change into Residential.	Existing estates may gain services and a larger local catchment.	Existing prices may already reflect the narrative; construction and competing future supply matter.
Clementi, Bedok and Kallang	Specific numeric GPR increases illustrated above.	Feasibility screening of the exact land interest, subject to ownership and approvals.	A mapped uplift can already be built out, subject to other controls, or uneconomic after costs.
Paya Lebar	Large Special Use → Reserve Site transition.	Monitor subsequent detailed zoning and implementation announcements.	High uncertainty about eventual use, density and timing in the compared layer.

Area totals count transitions into the exact Residential label. They are not net gains, exclude other residential-containing labels, and can include changes between housing-related categories. Boundaries are labelled using the 2019 planning-area layer for consistency.

Changes after the December 2025 snapshot

The following **selected** official notices were checked separately. They are not silently merged into the map, and this list is not a complete reconstruction of all amendments since gazette. Approval dates and notice dates are different. Use the linked original plan to identify the affected lots.

Location / status	Documented change	What it may mean
Sunbird Avenue · approved 7 Aug 2026; notice 11 Sep 2026	Residential GPR 2.1 → 3.0; +42.9% arithmetically.	A concrete density increase for the affected site; still requires site-specific feasibility. Approved plan.
International Business Park · approved 14 Jul 2026	Business Park, GPR 2.5 → Business Park-White, GPR 3.5; maximum White use quantum 30%.	Greater use flexibility and density for the affected lots, subject to that use limit. Not a blanket residential conversion. Approved plan.
River Valley Road · approved 14 Jul 2026	Residential → Residential with Commercial at 1st Storey; GPR stays 1.4.	A use-mix opportunity without a numeric density increase. Approved plan.

Location / status	Documented change	What it may mean
Pasir Panjang Road · approved 28 Jul 2026; notice 11 Sep 2026	Conservation-area designation.	Heritage can support neighbourhood character while limiting alterations and redevelopment options. Approved plan.
Upper Changi Road East / Upper Changi Road and nearby Upper Changi Link · proposed notice 18 Sep 2026	Affected residential land proposed to move from GPR 2.1 to 3.5, alongside park, open-space and road changes.	Possible future housing intensification; it remains a proposal in the notice checked.
Simei Road / Simei Lane · proposed notice 18 Sep 2026	Affected residential land proposed to move from GPR 2.1 to 3.4, with road rezoning.	Another watchlist item, not an approved uplift in this research.

Sources for the final two rows: URA proposed-amendment register. See also the July approved notice and current approved register. The current register displays a recent notice period; historical notice pages can contain additional approved changes.

Turning planning information into a property decision

For an owner-occupier: first test the future living environment. Check the actual walking route to planned amenities, prospective building massing opposite the unit, construction sequencing, road reservations and the protection of any view. A park designation can be more relevant to everyday enjoyment than a density uplift several streets away. Distinguish a plan from an operating amenity.

For a rental investor: estimate tenant demand and competing completions together. A growing employment or residential catchment can help demand, but new housing and commercial space can absorb it. Underwrite using comparable achieved rents, vacancy, maintenance, financing, transaction costs and an exit scenario. None of those market inputs is contained in these two zoning datasets, so the report makes no price, rental-yield or return forecasts.

For a redevelopment investor or collective-sale buyer: match the exact legal land interest to the complete site. Compare feasible future GFA with existing approved GFA, not simply the old mapped GPR. Review tenure, ownership, consent requirements, conservation, height, setbacks, access, infrastructure and delivery costs. Land Betterment Charge can arise when chargeable consent increases land value; a plan's GPR is not by itself the basis of the charge. SLA explanation.

An illustrative 10,000 m² site changing from GPR 2.8 to 4.2 has an arithmetic difference of 14,000 m² in GFA ceiling. It does **not** automatically create 14,000 m² of saleable area, and it says nothing about residual land value. This is a hypothetical whole-site example, not a calculation for the partial overlaps above. URA definition of GPR.

URA's Written Statement makes clear that the plan does not confer development rights and actual permitted intensity can be below its mapped maximum. Separately, harmonised floor-area definitions took effect for relevant development applications from 1 June 2023. Check the applicable measurement regime before comparing approved schemes across years; this does not imply that every observed GPR revision is caused by harmonisation. MP2025 Written Statement, especially section 5, floor-area harmonisation circular.

Method and limits

1. Download the two official land-use layers and the 2019 planning-area boundaries. Preserve source identifiers, retrieval time, byte size and SHA-256 hashes in the source manifest.

2. Transform WGS84 coordinates to Singapore SVY21 / EPSG:3414 for metre-based calculations. Repair invalid geometries: 45 old land-use polygons, 3 new ones and 5 planning-area geometries required repair.

3. Intersect the two layers. Compare LU_DESC, GPR, LU_TEXT, WHI_Q_MX and GPR_B_MN after whitespace and numeric formatting normalisation. OBJECTID is retained for traceability, not used as a cross-year matching key. The source catalogue does not fully define every supplementary field; no investment conclusion is drawn from an undocumented field meaning.

4. Retain intersections of at least 100 m², representing at least 2% of the smaller source polygon, with some interior remaining after a one-metre inward buffer. These thresholds suppress noise but can also omit genuine small changes. Exclusion reasons are saved in the local candidate audit.

5. Exclude 7,864 retained fragments whose only difference is GPR NA → blank. Treat EVA, SDP and LND as raw nonnumeric codes; do not convert them to zero or invent a numeric uplift. No unsupported code expansion is used.

6. Use separate categories for land-use differences and same-use GPR differences. A simultaneous use and density change appears under Land use change; inspect its before-and-after GPR rather than assuming the headline GPR counts capture it.

7. Separate changes in dataset coverage: the screened coverage-only output contains about 1,212.2 ha present only in 2025 and 3.4 ha present only in 2019. No prior land-use inference is made for land lacking a counterpart. Coverage differences do not, by themselves, prove reclamation or a new planning decision.

8. Simplify polygons by one metre only for display; remove zero-area lines and points created by overlay. Calculate reported areas from the unsimplified intersections. The map’s before/after colour modes show the changed footprints, not every unchanged polygon across Singapore. Colours are analytical and are not the official URA legend.

This is an islandwide **automated candidate comparison with selected documentary checks**, not a certified exhaustive parcel-by-parcel delta. It does not spatially compare separate conservation, landed-housing, building-height, underground-space or other Special and Detailed Control Plan layers. It does not infer transport opening dates, ownership, lease expiry, actual built intensity, transaction value, environmental approval or permission to develop. Official notices and SDCP controls take precedence over this screening view. URA control-plan context, 2019 planning-area dataset.

Use the map to select exact overlaps, then verify shortlisted sites in URA SPACE and the applicable approved and proposed notices. When a redevelopment concept is material to a decision, an Outline Application is an official route to test broad planning parameters before a formal application.